

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DANA E. YOUNG, SR.,

Plaintiff

-VS-

NO. 3:CV-05-2452

(Judge Kosik)

DENNIS J. KAZMENSKI, D.D.S.,
ROBERT MOCZULSKI, D.D.S.,

Defendants :

ORDER

____Plaintiff, Dana E. Young, Sr., filed this civil rights action on November 25, 2005, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983. (Doc. 1). On August 16, 2006, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 56. (Doc. 17). A supporting brief was filed on the same date. (Doc. 18). A response to defendants' motion was due to be filed by plaintiff on or before August 31, 2006. As of this date, plaintiff has neither submitted any opposition to the motion, nor requested an enlargement of time within which to do so.

The court is cognizant of the special difficulties facing *pro se* litigants. See Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). However, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit has emphasized that local rules play “a vital role in the district courts’ efforts to manage themselves and their dockets.” Eash v Riggins Trucking, Inc., 757 F.2d 557, 570 (3d Cir. 1985). Therefore, the court will afford the plaintiff an opportunity to respond to the defendants’ motion for summary judgment in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 and MDPA Local Rule 56.1. Failure to do so will result in the motion being deemed unopposed. See Stackhouse v. Mazurkiewicz, 951 F.2d 29 (3d Cir. 1991).

NOW, THEREFORE, THIS 21st DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2006, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The plaintiff is afforded twenty (20) days from the date of this Order to respond to the defendants' pending motion for summary judgment in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 56 and MDPA Local Rule 56.1;

2. Failure to timely respond to the defendants' motion for summary judgment will result in the motion being deemed unopposed.

s/Edwin M. Kosik
United States District Judge